

1 2. I am a Senior Staff Attorney at Plaintiff Electronic Frontier Foundation (“EFF”),
2 which is a nonprofit corporation established under the laws of California with its principal place of
3 business in San Francisco.

4 3. I am familiar with the prevailing hourly rates in the San Francisco Bay Area for
5 lawyers of comparable education, expertise, and experience. As part of the process of setting rates
6 for EFF attorneys, I have researched and reviewed the hourly rates for lawyers of comparable
7 education, expertise, and experience at other law firms.

8 4. From 1999 to 2004, I worked as an attorney with Perkins Coie LLP in the Bay Area,
9 and am familiar with Perkins Coie’s rates. If I had remained at Perkins Coie, my 2008 hourly rate
10 would likely be around \$550 - \$570.

11 5. When EFF revised its hourly rates for 2008, the change reflected the fact that its
12 rates had remained the same for 2005, 2006, and 2007. My 2008 rate reflects an approximately
13 7.3% average annual increase from my 2005 rate, and brought my rate in line with the currently
14 prevailing hourly rates.

15 6. In *Apple v. Does* (Santa Clara Superior Ct., Case No. 1-04-CV-032178), EFF was
16 paid my attorney’s fees at my 2007 rate pursuant to a court order, despite vigorous opposition by
17 Apple. In that case, the legal standard was whether the fee was at the prevailing billing rates of
18 comparable private attorneys. In *In re Sony BMG CD Technologies Litigation*, (S.D.N.Y. Case No
19 1:05-cv-09575-NRB), EFF was paid my attorney’s fees at this rate as part of the settlement of the
20 action in June 2006. While the amount of attorney’s fees for the class counsel was stipulated, a
21 court order approved the stipulation. (Dkt. No. 127). In *OPG v. Diebold*, 337 F. Supp. 2d 1195
22 (N.D. Cal. 2004), EFF was paid its attorney’s fees pursuant to a settlement.

23 7. After a careful review of our files on the case, I have estimated the minimum
24 number of hours I spent on the reply and this declaration as follows:
25
26
27
28

<u>Date</u>	<u>Task</u>	<u>Hours</u>
5/3/08	Review and analysis of ODNI opposition brief; Legal research on entitlement and eligibility for fees.	1.40
5/6/08	Legal research on entitlement to fees in response to arguments raised in ODNI opposition; Research prevailing rates.	1.80
	Draft section of reply brief regarding entitlement.	2.50
5/7/08	Review and revise reply brief section.	1.30
5/8/08	Review and revise reply brief; analysis of applicable precedent.	1.10
	Research prevailing rates.	0.40
	Draft declaration in support of reply brief.	0.60
	=====	=====
	Total reply hours:	9.10

8. In total, I spent no fewer than 9.1 hours on the reply brief and this declaration. At my 2008 hourly rates, my fees for this work are \$4,777.50.

9. In total, I have spent no fewer than 22.1 hours on this litigation, with 12.25 hours spent in 2007 when my hourly rate was \$425 per hour (\$5,206.25) and 9.85 hours spent in 2008 when my hourly rate was \$525 per hour (\$5,171.25). At my hourly rates during the relevant timeframe, my total fees are \$10,377.50.

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. Executed May 9, 2008 in San Francisco, California.

/s/ Kurt Opsahl
Kurt Opsahl